Chapter Six[1] I refer to the fact that in ancient India there were many forms of political life; it is a tragic mistake to suppose that despotism and pomp is necessarily congenial to the Indian soil. But subjection has wrought havoc among the Princes. They are given freedom to tyrannise within limits over their subjects, to have a salute of guns and all the trappings of royalty at the expense of their starving subjects, but in fact they are puppets. Mr. Chudgar (in his book, *Indian Princes]* quotes from *The Times* of 1853. The same conditions still prevail:

> We have emancipated these pale and ineffectual pageants of royalty from the ordinary fate that waits on an Oriental despotism. . . . This advantage (of securing able and vigorous princes through rebellion) [Ci]we have taken away from the inhabitants of the states of India still governed by native princes. It has been well said that we give these princes power without responsibility. Our hand of iron maintains them on the throne, despite their imbecility, their vices and their crimes. The result is in most of the states a chronic anarchy, under which the revenues of the states are dissipated between the mercenaries of the camp and minions of the Court. . . .

Till the Mutiny the policy of the East India Company and the British Government had been to annex states by deposing their rulers for mis-government or in cases when a ruler died without direct heir or for many other reasons. But it was Lord Dalhousie who protested against this policy, and, like a prophet, declared that the Indian Princes if maintained, would provide the bulwark of British power in India and its last stronghold. This prophecy was actually realised when a large number «f Princes rallied to the British and helped in putting down the so-called Mutiny; the last and puppet Emperor was deposed and made captive. The Government of India was taken over by the

[1] Gf. p. 178 »"fj note on